17

FEB 25 1943

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1942.

No. 763

DIXIE ROSE NURSERY, *Petitioner*,

v.

CONWAY P. COE, Commissioner of Patents, *Respondent*.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF, AND MOTION TO PROCEED ON CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD AND ORIGINAL EXHIBITS.

HARRY C. ROBB,
JOHN F. ROBB,
HARRY C. ROBB, JR.,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

CONTENTS.

Page

Motion to Proceed on Certified Transcript of Record and Original Exhibits 1-2

Petition for Writ of Certiorari 3-18

Summary of Matter Involved 4-5

The Facts 5-7

The Trial Below 7-8

The Decisions Below 8-11

Statement of Jurisdiction 11

The Questions Presented 11-14

Statute Involved 14-15

Reasons Relied on for the Allowance of the Writ... 15-18

Certification of Counsel 18

Brief in Support of Petition 19-38

Jurisdiction 19

Statement of the Case 19

Summary of Argument 19-20

Point I—The limitation contained in Section 5 of the Trade-Mark Act of 1905, prohibiting registration of *merely* descriptive or *merely* geographical marks, was solely intended to deny registration to those marks which are descriptive or geographical *as a whole* 21-23

Point II—Descriptiveness or geographical significance of a trade-mark may not properly be presumed or implied in the absence of strict and positive proof of such descriptiveness or geographical significance 24-26

Point III—The monopoly afforded by registration of a trade-mark is wholly separate and distinctively different from the monopoly afforded by a patent, 27-28

Page

Point IV—The history of the trade-mark practice before the Patent Office and as interpreted by this Court and other courts of the land, does not deny the right of registration to variety trade-marks for varieties of goods including varieties of plants....28-32

Point V—The rule in Singer Mfg. Co. v. June Mfg. Co., 163 U. S. 169, 185, 186, and Dupont Cellophane Co., Inc. v. Waxed Products Co., Inc. (C. C. A. 2), 85 F. (2d) 75, 80, cert. den. 304 U. S. 575 does not apply to the facts and evidence in the case here before the Court 32-33

Point VI—Disclaimer of descriptive or geographical features of composite trade-marks is not a prerequisite to registration under the Trade-Mark Act of 1905, when the trade-mark as a whole is not merely descriptive or merely geographical 34-35

Point VII—Adoption by a trial court of findings prepared and submitted by the winning party to the suit, as in this case, is not a sufficient compliance with Rule 52(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, in the absence of a written or oral opinion or expression of views of the court as to the sufficency of the trial evidence to support the judgment of the court 35-37

Point VIII—This case is one of first impression....37-38

Conclusion 38

TABLE OF CASES CITED.

Baldwin Company v. Robertson, 265 U. S. 168, 179 24
Batcheller v. Thompson (C. C. A. 2), 93 Fed. 660 ....16, 27
Discussion by Judge Gunnar H. Nordbye, 1 F. R. D. 27, 29 36
Dupont Cellophane Co., Inc. v. Waxed Products Co., Inc. (C. C. A. 2), 85 F (2d) 75, 80, cert. den. 304 U. S. 575 .....5, 9, 10, 16, 20, 32
Estate of P. D. Beckwith v. Commissioner of Patents, 252 U. S. 538 .....13, 16, 22, 34
Ex Parte Eastman Kodak Co., 55 U. S. P. Q. 361..... 29
Ex Parte W. F. Hebard & Co., 56 U. S. P. Q. 114 29

Page

Ex Parte Pfister Hybrid Corn Co., 56 U. S. P. Q. 275.. 31
Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co. v. Wolf Bros., & Co., 240 U. S. 251 .....5, 16, 22
Hygienic Products Co. v. Coe, 85 F (2d) 264, 265 24
In Re Pitney-Bowes Postage Meter Co., 6 F (2d) 717..16, 27
Lawrence Mfg. Co. v. Tennessee Mfg. Co., 138 U. S. 537 .....16, 32
Menendez v. Holt, 128 U. S. 514 .....5, 16, 32
President Suspender Co. v. Macwilliam (C. C. A. 2), 238 Fed. 159, cert. den. 343 U. S. 636 .....5, 16, 26
Sawyer v. Kellogg (New Jersey), 7 Fed. 720 .....16, 27
Scandinavia Belting Co. v. Asbestos and Rubber Works of America (C. C. A. 2), 257 Fed. 937, cert. den. 250 U.S. 644 26
Singer Mfg. Co. v. June Mfg. Co., 163 U. S. 169, 185, 186 5, 10, 16, 20, 32
United States v. Forness (C. C. A. 2), 125 F (2d) 928..17-36

STATUTES CITED.

Judicial Code (as amended February 13, 1925), Sec. 240(a), Chapter 229, 43 Stat. 936 11
R. S. 4915, Title LX, 53 Stat. 1212, 35 U. S. C. 63 .....5, 24
Trade-Mark Act of February 20, 1905 (as amended), 33 Stat. 727, 15 U. S. C. A. 85 .....4, 14